



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of January 14, 2016

City Hall Council Chambers * 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 * www.loganutah.org

Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session Thursday, January 14, 2016. Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Planning Commissioners Present: Amanda Davis, David Butterfield, Dave Newman, Russ Price, Tony Nielson, Eduardo Ortiz, Sara Sinclair

Staff Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Amber Reeder, Aaron Smith, Craig Carlston, Bill Young, Paul Taylor, Craig Humphreys, Debbie Zilles

Teresa Harris, the City Recorder, presented the oath of office to new Commissioner Eduardo Ortiz.

Minutes as written and recorded from the December 10, 2015 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Nielson moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 16-001 Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan Adoption Logan City is requesting adoption of the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan which addresses how change, both within and outside the Hillcrest boundaries, will affect the neighborhood, and devise strategies to mitigate negative impacts and protect the character of the neighborhood.

STAFF: Aaron Smith reviewed the request to adopt the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan (HNP), a plan meant to guide future growth, development, infrastructure and public investment decisions. The HNP addresses how change and development will affect the neighborhood and devise strategies to mitigate negative impacts, protect neighborhood character, and develop community assets.

This project was initiated in late 2014 with the formulation of a Steering Committee comprised of community members, City staff, Neighborhood Council representation, and Planning Commission and Municipal Council members. This diverse group met on several occasions to provide input and help shape this planning effort.

The vision is to develop a goal driven document that outlines the unique character, opportunities, and obstacles facing the Hillcrest Neighborhood in the immediate future based on resident input and the collection of secondary sources, such as demographic and land-use data, and use the information to formulate planning recommendations.

The overall goals include ensuring and promoting a sense of community by identifying and implementing changes that will enhance and stabilize the neighborhood, including engaging as many residents of Hillcrest as possible through a thorough and transparent planning process; identifying issues relating to housing, land use, parks and open space, transportation, and the overall character of the neighborhood; developing value statements that reflect the desires of the Hillcrest residents; and establishing short and long-term planning recommendations and implementation strategies that reflect the values statements of the neighborhood.

The core Hillcrest neighborhood values as delineated by residents and as stated in the HNP are:

- The single family character of the neighborhood.
- A family friendly neighborhood.
- A strong sense of community and neighborhood volunteerism.
- Development that is neighborly in scale and does not conflict with the single family character.
- Roads and public right of ways that are calm and pedestrian friendly.
- A strong connection to open space and recreational opportunities.
- A high aesthetic value in the neighborhood.
- USU as a core component of the neighborhood identity.

The Plan is divided into three sections: Section A identifies the existing conditions; Section B identifies the public processes and public input received; and Section C identifies the specific recommendations made as part of this plan.

The Hillcrest neighborhood has approximately 4,000 residents on approximately 812 acres. Demographically, residents tend to be older, racially homogeneous, wealthier, employed, better educated, more likely to be a homeowner and less likely to have children still at home. Hillcrest is one of the younger neighborhoods in Logan. Most of the homes were built post WWII and typify the mid-century modern architectural style. The oldest Hillcrest neighborhoods are found adjacent to USU while the newest areas are found in the Deer Pen section. Hillcrest has the highest rate of owner occupancy in the City with approximately 90% of its housing stock owner-occupied as compared to the rest of Logan City which has an owner occupancy rate of 42%. The neighborhood has very few commercial areas, and outside of the student housing complexes associated with USU, has no multi-family housing.

PUBLIC: A series of public outreach and comment opportunities were conducted as part of the plan development process. A visioning workshop was held on January 29, 2015 and an open house on October 28, 2015. A postcard was mailed to each property owner for events, as well as specific Planning Commission and Municipal Council hearing processes. Comments received have been documented and where appropriate, integrated into the plan.

A letter from Larry Brown addressing concerns related to neighborhood issues and the realignment of 1000 North at 1200 East, and an email from Michael Timmons outlining his concerns about the Deer Pen property and changes to the FLUP were received and distributed prior to the meeting

Morris Poole, 55 Bristol Road, said there has been a lot of good work put into this plan, especially regarding sidewalks. He is concerned about the 1200 East Corridor because it is a hill and getting in and out can be difficult. He does not believe commercial would be successful and is not needed in that area. The land north of 1500 North is soft due to a spring owned by USU, he suggested working with North Logan to make that area into a park, which would be more compatible for the area.

David Christensen, 1430 East 900 North, believes commercial along the 1200 East corridor makes sense, however, is concerned there may be some businesses that are not compatible with the family-oriented neighborhood. Chairman Davis said there are permitted uses within particular zone designations. Mr. DeSimone, the Community Development Director, noted that the recommendation for the zone is Mixed Use (MU) which would include a mixture of housing and commercial. He encouraged residents to review the table of permitted uses within the Mixed Use zone.

Paul Parker, 1504 Lynwood Avenue, pointed out that the recommended Mixed Use area is located next to a religious building, which would limit what is allowed. The idea of commercial is not always "Walmart" and Mixed Use is much more limiting. The proposed realignment of 1000 North (going east/west) would increase traffic on Ellendale. Mr. Smith explained that the proposed streetscape would be redesigned to calm potential traffic resulting from the realignment.

Debbie Brough, 1362 North 1720 East, pointed out the Steering Committee and the majority of residents at the public open houses preferred the lowest density visualization (Map 10.4 Visualization1) for the Deer Pen area.

MOTION: Commissioner Sinclair moved to **continue discussion** of the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan to the January 28, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Sinclair Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz **Passed: 7-0**
Yea: A. Davis, D. Butterfield, R. Price, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-002 Hillcrest (NP) Future Land Use (FLUP) Map Amendments Logan City is requesting to amend the Future Land Use Plan Map (FLUP) for those areas identified in the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan as suitable for map amendment.

STAFF: Aaron Smith outlined the specific areas to be addressed. Area 1 is the gravel pit area along 1400 North and 1200 East which is currently designated in the FLUP as Campus Residential (CR). The consensus was to change the designation from CR to a combination of Detached Residential (DR) and Multi-family Residential (MR). The Zoning was changed within the last two years from Campus Residential (CR) to NR-6 and MR-20 (on southern parcels). This FLUP modification will bring the two documents into consistency.

Area 2 is the LDS church site north of 1100 North that was previously owned by USU, and now the LDS Church. This parcel needs to be changed from Public (PUB) to Detached Residential (DR) to reflect the change in ownership and new church building.

Area 3 includes the two sites along 1200 East. The first is the “golden toaster” site that is now owned by USU and should be changed to Public. The second is the Evergreen/1200 East block comprised of 14 individual lots and is proposed for a change from Detached Residential (DR) to Mixed Use (MU) to facilitate new development on this block.

Area 4 is the Deer Pen property owned by Logan City. The proposal is to change the designation from Recreation (REC) to Detached Residential (DR). The site was originally acquired for a future cemetery; however, the existing cemetery has several decades of available capacity and the City’s Administration believes this land is more important for future residential growth. The proposed FLUP amendment retains large areas of open space along the canal and the drainages.

PUBLIC: A series of public outreach and comment opportunities were conducted as part of the plan development process. A visioning workshop was held on January 29, 2015 and an open house on October 28, 2015. A postcard was mailed to each property owner for both events as well as specific Planning Commission and Municipal Council hearing processes. Comments received have been documented and where appropriate, integrated into the plan.

MOTION: Commissioner Sinclair moved to **continue discussion** regarding the Hillcrest Future Land Use (FLUP) amendment to the January 28, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Sinclair Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz **Passed: 7-0**
Yea: A. Davis, D. Butterfield, R. Price, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-003 Hillcrest (NP) Rezone Logan City is requesting a rezone of areas identified in the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan as suitable for rezone.

STAFF: Aaron Smith outlined three specific areas identified for rezone. Area 1, the residential area east of 1600 East, is proposed to be rezoned from NR-6 to NR-4 as the lot sizes and density within this area are more indicative of four units/acre in the NR-4 rather than six units/acre in the NR-6.

This action involves approximately 225 lots. Area 2 involves rezoning the subdivisions within the Deer Crest area from NR-6 to NR-4 and the City-owned properties in Deer Pen from Public to NR-4. The subdivided areas contain approximately 93 residential lots. The City-owned properties will be subdivided in the future with an approximate residential lot count of 40 residential units over the 33 acres. Area 3 involves rezoning the “golden toaster” site from NR-6 to Public to reflect the change to USU ownership, and rezoning the Evergreen/1200 East block containing 14 individual lots from NR-6 to Mixed Use (MU).

PUBLIC: A series of public outreach and comment opportunities were conducted as part of the plan development process. A visioning workshop was held on January 29, 2015 and an open house on October 28, 2015. A postcard was mailed to each property owner for both events as well as specific Planning Commission and Municipal Council hearing processes. Comments received have been documented and where appropriate, integrated into the plan.

MOTION: Commissioner Sinclair moved to **continue discussion** regarding the Hillcrest Rezone to the January 28, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Sinclair Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz **Passed: 7-0**
Yea: A. Davis, D. Butterfield, R. Price, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-004 Blue Haven [Design Review & Code Amendment] AE Urbia Architects/John & David R. Brandley, authorized agent/owner(s), request a 5-story student housing development accommodating 372 students. Application also includes a text amendment to modify the CR density calculation from the traditional unit per acre to a person/bed per acre in order to provide flexibility for designing multi-family residential developments in the Campus Residential zoning district. The project is located on 1.54 acres at 743 North 800 East in the Campus Residential (CR) zone; TIN 05-040-0003;-10;-18;-20.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request to amend the Land Development Code (LDC) §17.12.110 & 17.15.120 so that maximum densities are based on number of occupants/beds per acre rather than the current language, which limits number of dwelling units/apartments per acre. The existing maximum density in the Campus Residential (CR) zone is 40 dwelling units/apartments per acre with a maximum occupancy of up to 6 individuals per unit (no more than 2 per bedroom). The proposal is to amend the Code to allow 240 occupants per acre configured in any number of dwelling units.

Staff conducted research of six college towns to determine if other cities based densities off total number of beds or total number of apartments. All the cities researched based densities off apartments/dwelling units per acre. Throughout zoning history in Logan City, with the exception of group homes/sororities/fraternities which are individually and conditionally permitted, maximum densities have always been based off of dwelling units per acre. The City allows up to three (3) unrelated individuals per dwelling unit except for the Campus Residential Zone, which allows up to a maximum of six (6) unrelated per dwelling units. The allowance for up to 6 individuals increases overall numbers and allows the option for more apartment unit size diversity and provides a wider range of housing options. Not all student housing projects maximize occupancy levels and some in recent years, based on market demand, have been built with low bedroom counts.

The Campus Residential (CR) zone was created to intentionally locate students near Utah State University for reasons including reduced transportation impacts and relief to rental pressures on traditional single-family neighborhoods. The Logan City General Plan indicates a density range of 30-50 units per acre and general regulations to accomplish goals based on future growth demands. The CR zone specifically regulates growth and development through the City’s adopted zoning ordinance (Land Development Code). Density of up to 240 units per acre would conflict with the adopted General Plan. Going from 40 units per acre to 240 units per acre would result in 6 times more kitchens and most likely additional bathrooms and overall square footages causing utility and infrastructure adjustments.

Although the Campus Residential zone has been slightly adjusted and refined over the past few years, staff concludes that the existing Code manages growth appropriately based on the direction given in the General Plan and recommends denial of this code amendment.

The applicant is proposing to demolish all four (4) existing buildings on the site, combine the properties into one and construct a 171,762 SF student housing building with a 299-stall parking structure that is separated into two sections on the east and west sides of the property. The proposal is for 114 dwelling units and 366 beds. The CR zone allows 40 dwelling units per acre and with a 1.54 acre site, 61 dwelling units with a maximum occupancy of 366 would be allowed. Pending the adoption or denial of the proposed Code Amendment, the project is conditioned to meet densities allowed within the CR zone. This alternative parking proposal is an 18% variation from the requirement and would require the Planning Commission's approval.

Mr. Holley recommending continuing the Design Review portion of the request to the February 25, 2016 meeting and moving ahead with the Code Amendment portion so that it could proceed through the Municipal Council process. The Code Amendment decision could affect the design of the project.

PROPONENT: Jeremy Raymond, from Olson & Hoggan Law Firm, representing developer John Brandley, asked the Commission to reconsider discussing the Design Review portion of the project tonight (in addition to the Code Amendment proposal) as there are professionals from Salt Lake in attendance. It is their position that the overall mass and design of the project, as proposed, will not change with the Code Amendment decision. Chairman Davis said that the perspective from the Commission is that the Code Amendment decision will dramatically affect the project; the Commission decided unanimously to continue the Design Review portion of the request to the February 25, 2016 meeting. Mr. Raymond explained that it is critical to understand upfront that they are not seeking to increase the maximum density. The desire is to provide more flexibility for a developer and to allow students more choice in living accommodations. Orem City allows occupancy units rather than dwelling units (based density on bedrooms). Logan is a unique community with a Campus Residential zone that is designed to house students near USU. This is a perfect project for this zone and will help alleviate student rental concerns in single-family neighborhoods. The requested amendment will help make this a dynamic project and economically feasible. Mr. Raymond pointed out that the Logan General Plan states *"As we look to the future, we need to recognize that eventually Logan's growth and strength will have to be inwardly directed"*. Logan is basically boxed in with limited availability for green development. This proposal will remove blight (fraternity houses) and bring in a new project. The Plan also states *"...we need to turn our attention to encouraging, upgrading, and redeveloping the areas within our community. The primary challenges for the future will be refocusing growth inward"*, which acknowledges that this is a challenge. Mr. Raymond pointed out that the proposed amendment will only be applicable to the Campus Residential zone, which is a high-density allocated area; no other changes or restrictions are being proposed and projects will still be restricted by the current regulations. The parking is proposed at 82% which seems to be more than adequate based on the submitted parking study showing the average peak demand is 0.71 vehicles per student.

Kordel Braley, a traffic engineer from RSG in SLC, said they spoke with the management of the apartment complexes that were surveyed to determine occupancy and number of beds. The data in the parking survey was collected between 1:00 a.m. and 4:00 a.m., which is when parking should be at maximum usage. The sites were visited and counted multiple times and any visitor parking would have been counted into the survey. One of the goals of the Campus Residential zone is to reduce traffic congestion, which is always a challenge near a college. It would be great if there were two stalls per resident, but there is something to be said about not over-designing parking; having an appropriately parked facility can help encourage behavior. This project is designed to be pedestrian-friendly and is close to campus. He stands behind the findings of the parking report. He pointed out that Figure 4 shows parking demands near BYU and UVU, providing a second data point of less than 0.71 vehicles per student.

Ryan Mackowiak, from AE Urbia Architects, wanted to make sure the Commission was clear about the fact that the Code Amendment is not changing student density; it is only addressing occupant density. Based on the comments thus far, the building would be very similar to how it is proposed tonight (with fewer units that are larger). He noted that part of the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan is to decrease the Campus Residential area, which would then create a much higher demand in the zone. Developers providing these types of projects are providing for a demand that is being trimmed out. Single-family homes in neighborhoods are being rented to students because there is more need for student housing options.

PUBLIC: Kent Field said he understands the incentives for different sized units. He manages and owns student housing near USU. Most developers and financiers take advantage of the Campus Residential zone by pushing the density to the maximum allowed (6 beds per unit) which leads to single student housing. There is a large demand for married student housing, which is becoming more of a shortage. A project like this, where density allotments can be tweaked, could offer a larger variety of housing for students who want to live near campus.

Braden Allen, representing the fraternity house that is currently located on the site, said 22 of the 27 students who presently live in the facility have cars (81%). They have not had any parking problems and have rented out stalls in the past. Building extra parking just for the sake of having it is quite costly. There is a bus stop directly across the street. Married student housing needs are increasing and there needs to be more options available.

John Brandley said they have spent thousands of dollars and time to provide factual research to determine what parking equilibrium the project needs to have. Envision Cache Valley promotes walkable communities and placing students near USU helps reduce traffic and increase air quality. Parking has changed dramatically over the past few years in this zone. Parking stalls are quite expensive (approx. \$15,000 per stall). As a taxpayer, he would like to incentivize developers, who have morals and live in the community, to be able to build exactly what the City has envisioned in the Code, which is a housing project near campus to alleviate rentals in the neighborhoods. The Code encourages “...grow through infill and redevelopment” because there are fewer options than other communities for green development. This proposal meets and exceeds what the Code asks for; with the request for a reduction in parking. There is a free transit system for students who do not have vehicles. He explained that they are not asking for more beds than the Code allows, the goal is to be able to provide for the market needs. This allows better options for financing and occupancy. He appreciates the Commission’s consideration and advised they are willing to work with the City to make this project work.

David Wallace said he has many nieces and nephews attending college – all who have vehicles. Parking is a disaster and he believes that a lot of the parking in the study is flawed, for example, there are over 50 cars parked on USU (off 800 East) due to the shortage of parking in the area. There is quite a deficiency of parking in the area. If there are open stalls; he suggested renting the stalls to recoup costs.

Jakob Brandley said a project like this is in a good location and would be great. Many single-family homes in the Adams neighborhood area are rented out; this project could help decrease illegal rentals. There are many students without vehicles who want to live near campus.

Tom Galloway said parking was an issue when he built rentals in the Campus Residential zone 12 years ago. He said many students do not have cars and his facility (700 North 700 East) has adequate parking. Students who have to live further away will have to have a vehicle; however, projects close to campus provide an opportunity for those who do not. He is supportive of the Code amendment, which would allow for the provision to provide better housing options.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman pointed out that 3 out of the 4 sites surveyed had illegally parked vehicles. From a business standpoint, a potential renter having a guaranteed stall would be a great selling point. The survey seems to back up the 1 stall per 1 occupant requirement. Mr. Braley said if the role of the Commission is to ensure the economic vitality of a business, that would be correct, but if the goal is to protect the overall well-being of the community, there are other ways to look at parking. Commissioner Newman noted that Orem and Provo must have a difference in car ownership per capita than Logan based on the findings. Mr. Braley said that may be based on better options for public transportation access (commuter rail, TRAX, UTA) in the Utah County region which may be why the parking demand is lower.

Commissioner Ortiz noted that although it would be ideal to have 100% parking availability, it might be beneficial for lower-income students who might pay less in rent and it would be better for the air quality in Cache Valley to have fewer vehicles, which seems to justify having less parking.

Commissioner Price appreciated the explanation of the methodology for the parking survey; the numbers speak for themselves. He advised that he is not a fan of over parking; however, there are profound differences in the way resources are used in different areas. While it would be great to minimize vehicle usage, there is no appetite in Logan for providing the needed infrastructure for that to happen. Local transit systems are not adequate and the majority of students have jobs and other needs to travel outside the valley. Logan is more isolated than many other college areas; Orem and Provo have more transportation advantages. He likes the theory of less parking, nevertheless, Logan has a different fact set that has to be taken into consideration, and reducing parking does not make sense from a legibility standpoint.

Commissioner Price explained that legibility means that not only the government, but everyone who interacts in a particular location, would like to be able to understand what it is that they will be allowed to do and how they will be allowed to do it. Legibility and legislation are closely aligned. Legislation is brought forward so that the environment is legible. The Code provides legibility and outlines what the expectations are. The Planning Commission can make recommendations to the legislative body (Municipal Council) that ultimately make the decisions. He does not find a compelling reason to change the approach that has been taken. If developers feel the need for change to allow flexibility, he recommended they contact the members of the Municipal Council.

Commissioner Butterfield said, as it relates to parking, the Commission is not overly “black and white” and has had case-by-case decisions; however, he does not find a compelling reason to make a change when the process for the current regulations went through thorough research, effort and public input.

Mr. DeSimone pointed out that the Commission is the land use advisory board and can make recommendations to the Municipal Council.

Commissioner Nielson said he has listened to this debate for many years. The City has established a “box” for development and now there is a request for change. The requirement is for 100% parking (1 stall per 1 unit). Every person deserves the opportunity to have a parking stall. He agrees that not all students will have a car; however, a stall should be available to them (i.e. for a visitor) and it is his firm belief that the requirements should be met. This proposal is 67 stalls short of 100%.

Commissioner Newman acknowledged that there have been many valid points made. There is definitely a demand for married student housing. Chairman Davis pointed out that the current Code does not disallow this type of housing. Commissioner Newman said although there may be some economic pressure on increasing the number of occupants, the parameters of the Code need to be followed.

Chairman Davis explained that the Campus Residential zone started much denser, with lower parking and it was found to not be working. The Municipal Council and Planning Commission went through quite an extensive process to get to the current requirements. She feels that the process has been well vetted and to change it for one project is not a good idea.

Commissioner Price said this would be a good area for parking relief and he would like to see the community become more walkable, however, he would need to hear specific reasons and mitigating circumstances to allow for a decrease in parking.

Mr. DeSimone said parking has been a challenge, especially in this zone, however, the elected officials of the City have determined that a 1-1 ratio is appropriate.

Commissioner Price said he believes it may be more of a parking management problem and advised that there is a continuing need to look at other municipalities to find ways to ameliorate the distribution of parking.

MOTION: Commissioner Price moved to **continue** a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 16-004 to the February 25, 2016 meeting and a **forward a recommendation for denial** to the Municipal Council for the Code Amendment with the findings as listed below. Commissioner Nielson seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR DENIAL OF CODE AMENDMENT

1. The Land Development Code's Campus Residential maximum density of 40 units/acre was established through public process with resident input and neighborhood feedback;
2. The current densities in the CR zone are within the range set forth in the General Plan with planning and engineering efforts and future growth impacts based on these figures.
3. A density of 80 units per acre in the Campus Residential zone is not consistent with the direction of the General Plan.

Moved: Commissioner Price Seconded: Commissioner Nielson **Passed: 7-0**

Yea: A. Davis, D. Butterfield, R. Price, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-005 SA Ferrous Industries [Design Review] Alex Bearnson, authorized agent/owner requests to construct a 45,000 SF warehouse facility for sorting and transfer of recycled materials on 9.37 acres at 200 North 1900 West in the Industrial Park (IP) zone; TIN 05-060-0011.

STAFF: Ms. Reeder explained this project was reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission in 2013 but the permit expired. The applicant is now ready to move forward with the project. Development includes a new office on the corner of the property, parking area and warehouse facility for sorting and transfer of recycled materials including pulp paper, plastics, and metals.

PROPONENT: Alex Bearnson said this project been through a lengthy process to get to where it is and they want to meet all requirements. It will be a nice facility and all waste/recycled material will be stored inside and if anything is outside, it will be heavily screened.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Ms. Reeder confirmed for Commissioner Price that both buildings – office and warehouse - (for both phases) are being considered at this meeting

Commissioner Nielson asked about the fence. Ms. Reeder advised that a chain link fence is proposed along the east and south side with a composite solid fence on the north and west sides (outlined in condition 8).

MOTION: Commissioner Price moved to **conditionally approve** a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 16-005 with the conditions of approval as listed below. Commissioner Sinclair seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. Right-of-way improvements (curb, gutter, park strip, street trees, and sidewalk) to be constructed on street frontages.
3. A pedestrian path between buildings on the site shall be delineated.
4. Land set asides required per Code, a minimum of 10% of the site (40,816 SF) to be open space and a minimum of 10% of the site (40,816 SF) to be useable outdoor space.
5. A Performance Landscaping Plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, shall be submitted for approval to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The plan shall include the following:
 - a. Street trees to be provided along frontages at a minimum of 1 tree per 30' of frontage, species as approved by City Forester.
 - b. Open Space (landscaped) areas and useable outdoor space shall consist of a minimum of 20% of the total site.
 - c. 20 trees per gross acre of land (187 trees) and 50 shrubs/perennials/ornamental grasses per gross acre of land (469 shrubs) shall be planted throughout the property (25 % shall be evergreen) as per LDC §17.39.050. A minimum of 5 species of trees are required.
 - d. Vertical landscape shall be provided in bermed areas to visually screen parking areas. Plant species should vary and provide visual interest year round.
6. Screening shall be implemented on the interior of the site, adjacent to the warehouse or in areas that will allow vertical landscaped elements and/or architectural elements to screen the warehouse building.
7. The north and west elevations of the office building shall provide for 30% transparency (window fenestration) in their design.
8. A screening fence is required on the north and west sides of the transfer facility. The fencing must be 6-8' tall, be solid and sight-obscuring, have landscaping along the entire fence line, and be constructed of a durable material such as wood or masonry.
9. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Director of Community Development shall receive a written memorandum from each of the following departments or agencies indicating that their requirements have been satisfied:
 - a. Fire
 - i. Fire department access through gates to be discussed at the time of a building permit.
 - ii. Two hydrants near the building are required to meet fire flow and hydrant distribution.
 - iii. Each building and suite shall be labeled to be seen from the street for approaching emergency vehicles.
 - iv. Fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems required.
 - b. Light and Power
 - i. Public utility easements on all property lines, 5' PUE on all property lines facing a road and a 10' PUE on all other property lines shall be recorded.
 - c. Engineering
 - i. Stormwater shall be designed per Logan City Stormwater Design Standards, an additional requirement shall be that all rainfall events less than or equal to the 90th percent storm event shall be maintained and infiltrated onsite and not be allowed to discharge to City drainage system, including canals and ditches. A portion of this could be stored and used as secondary water in accordance with state law.
 - ii. Provide City with water shares and/or water rights for increased demands of this development on the City system (or in-lieu fee, as allowed).

- iii. All onsite fire lines to building and hydrants shall be considered a private line and shall developer shall enter into an agreement with City regarding these lines. City will provide developer with a draft copy of this agreement.
- iv. Developer shall obtain necessary easements for the Logan City Environmental department for construction of the pressurized sewer line.
- v. All work done in SR-30 shall comply with Logan City Standards and all UDOT permits and standards
- vi. Dedicate all right-of-ways along 1900 West to construct full movement access and turn lanes with required stacking lengths and deceleration lengths.
- vii. Project should be presented to CAMP to ensure that increased traffic does not trigger other improvements to SR-30. These could include turn lanes, deceleration lanes, and acceleration lanes.
- viii. All onsite fire lines to building and hydrants shall be considered a private line; developer shall enter into an agreement with City regarding these lines. City will provide developer with a draft copy of this agreement.
- ix. Implement Low Impact Design features for stormwater collection system to the maximum reasonable extent that this site allows to infiltrate the required storm less than or equal to the 90th percentile storm event.
 - i. Comply with Public Works design and construction standards & specifications.
- d. Water
 - i. Developer will be responsible to install infrastructure to get water services to the property from existing City water infrastructure.
 - ii. Each building will require a separate meter and service line.
- e. Water/Cross Connection
 - i. All water meter setters must meet current Logan City standards.
 - ii. All water mains, fire risers, and landscape irrigation systems must have approved back flow assemblies and be tested.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The building is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjoining or area properties because of the building design, landscaping, and setbacks are consistent with area properties.
2. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The project provides a useful resource as it is near related uses such as the landfill and transfer station.
4. The door and vestibule on the north elevation meet the intent for building orientation to the street and is accepted in lieu of having an entrance on the north and west elevations.
5. The project is consistent with the intent of the Industrial Zone as stated in LDC §17.16.040E.
6. The use provides adequate off-street parking in conformance with Title 17.
7. The project, as conditioned, conforms to landscaping requirements in Title 17.
8. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.

Moved: Commissioner Price Seconded: Commissioner Sinclair **Passed: 7-0**

Yea: A. Davis, D. Butterfield, R. Price, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-006 B&C Subdivision [Subdivision Permit] Blayne Nielsen/Brookside Development LLC, authorized agent/owner request a 3-lot subdivision on 3.14 acres at 2108 North 600 West in the Industrial Park (IP) zone; TIN 04-079-0010.

STAFF: Ms. Reeder reviewed the request to divide the property at 2108 North 600 West to separate the office building and warehouse building onto individual lots and the undeveloped northern portion of the property into a separate parcel. Lot 1 includes the undeveloped area, Lot 2 includes the warehouse building, and Lot 3 is the office building. The buildings were constructed in 2004.

The property is zoned Industrial Park (IP) and is also designated IP in the Future Land Use Plan. There is not a minimum lot size in the Industrial zone. New construction would be reviewed for consistency with state and local laws. There are some discrepancies regarding the right-of-way line of 600 West at this location between the surveyor's research and the City designation. The proponent is doing additional research to clarify the correct location of the 600 West property line.

PROPONENT: None

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Commissioner Price asked if the Commission could approve two (2) lots and if the proponent decides they want three (3), they can obtain a variance. Ms. Reeder agreed that it could be conditioned that way (condition 2 amended).

MOTION: Commissioner Sinclair moved to **conditionally approve** a Subdivision Permit as outlined in PC 16-006 with the amended conditions of approval as listed below. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. Two (2) lots are approved with this subdivision permit, as proposed, with the existing buildings on the same lot and meeting all setback requirements.
3. Utility and access easements to be indicated over infrastructure in the project.
4. Provide 10' public utility easement on all property lines at the bounds of the subdivision and 5' PUE on all other property lines.
5. Street trees are required in park strip at 30' on center (average) along all street frontages.
6. Sidewalk to be completed and right-of-way improvements to be completed for the subdivision or agreements with Public Works per LDC §17.47.080.
7. The final plat shall be recorded within one (1) year of this action or comply with LDC 17.58 Expirations and Extensions of Time.
8. Prior to recording of a final plat or issuance of a building permit, the Director of Community Development shall receive a written memorandum from the following departments indicating that their requirement has been satisfied:
 - a. Engineering
 - i. Each lot shall have independent water and sewer connections.
 - ii. An association with CC&R's shall be established to address all shared infrastructure; this includes but is not limited to storm drainage system, accesses, parking, right of ways, etc.
 - iii. Subdivision does not seem to address the area between 600 West and Lots 1, 2, and 3. Is this common area or a separate lot. Plat shows no bend in 600 West but lot descriptions do, verify which is correct.
 - iv. Easements for access to all lots to be shown on plat
 - v. Based on road alignment west of 600 West, dedicate necessary right-of-way along 2200 North to ensure road right of way of 66' and alignment can be preserved for future road.
 - vi. If not dedicated to the City when original development occurred, dedicate 7' of right-of-way along 600 West frontage for future 80' right of way.
 - vii. Public Works to be provided construction plans to review for connections to City services.
 - b. Water/Cross Connection
 - i. All water meter setters must meet current Logan City standards.
 - ii. All building mains, fire suppression systems, and landscape irrigation systems must have approved backflow systems and be tested.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The subdivision is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because it meets the minimum requirements of the LDC.
2. Each lot, as conditioned, conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan LDC.
3. Each lot is suitable for development within the Industrial (IP) zone.
4. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17.47 concerning hearings, procedures, application requirements and plat preparations.
5. The project meets the goals and objectives of the Industrial Park (IP) designation within the Logan General Plan.
6. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.

Moved: Commissioner Sinclair Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz **Passed: 7-0**

Yea: A. Davis, D. Butterfield, R. Price, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

WORKSHOP ITEMS for January 28, 2016 – continuation of discussion of Hillcrest items.

OTHER BUSINESS

Amanda Davis was nominated to serve as the 2016 Chair with Russ Price serving as Vice-Chair. The decision was passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded for the Logan City Planning Commission meeting of January 14, 2016.

Michael A. DeSimone
Community Development Director

Amanda Davis
Planning Commission Chair

Russ Holley
Senior Planner

Amber Reeder
Planner II

Debbie Zilles
Administrative Assistant